

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful examination given to the present application. The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action, and it is respectfully submitted that the application as amended is in condition for allowance.

Claims 8-10 have been canceled. Claim 14 has been amended.

Claims 11-13 and 14/11-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Laid-Open Utility Model 100976/1988 ('976 document) in view Richter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,925,694), and Nakano et al. (JP 56038964 A). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of the references disclose or suggest that the "inner surface of said ring-like portion further comprising at least one recess corresponding to each first protrusion portion so that each first protrusion portion is engaged with a corresponding recess" as recited in claim 11. Similar language is found in claim 13. The Office Action cites Nakano as disclosing these elements, however, the Office Action does not specify the elements in the Nakano device that make up such a structure and it is respectfully queried where the Examiner believes such structure is present in Nakano.

Nakano discloses that a rectifying diode portion, consisting of a rectifying diode buried with a diode 4 in an insulator, is inserted between the base of a brush leaf spring 1 and a terminal metal 2 (Abstract). In Nakano, the inserted rectifying diode portion is engaged in a slit between projecting pieces 8a and 8b formed on the bottom surface of a retaining plate 6 (Abstract).

Nakano does not disclose or suggest any element that could be consider a recess on the inner surface of ring-like portion of an inductor forming member of a rotor. Nakano also does not disclose any element that could be consider a recess corresponding to a protrusion portion so

that the protrusion portion is engaged with a corresponding recess. Therefore, Nakano does not disclose or suggest that an inner surface of the ring-like portion includes at least one recess corresponding to each first protrusion portion so that each first protrusion portion is engaged with a corresponding recess. As such, the Nakano patent cannot remedy the deficiencies of the '976 document and Richter. Thus, even if combined, the references do not disclose all the elements of the claimed invention.

Further, in regards to claim 11, none of the references disclose or suggest "at least one protrusion on the outer surface of the peripheral wall, said protrusion including a first protrusion portion extending in an axial direction of said rotor yoke and a second protrusion portion extending in a circumferential direction of said rotor yoke at a first end of said first protrusion portion, said first protrusion portion including a projection extending from a second end of said first protrusion portion, ... wherein said second protrusion portion is located against the first axial end of said ring-like portion and said projection is against the second axial end of the ring-like portion when said ring-like portion is fitted against said peripheral wall of the rotor yoke" as recited in claim 11. The Office Action cites Nakano as disclosing these elements, however, the Office Action does not specify the elements in the Nakano device that make up such a structure and it is respectfully queried where the Examiner believes such structure is present in Nakano.

Nakano discloses projecting pieces 8a and 8b formed on the bottom surface of a retaining plate 6 (Abstract). In Nakano, both of the projecting pieces are located on an axial end rather than on the peripheral wall, and a ring-like portion of an inductor forming member of a rotor is not even disclosed. Therefore, Nakano does not disclose or suggest a first protrusion portion extending in an axial direction of a rotor yoke with a second protrusion portion extending in a circumferential direction of the rotor yoke at a first end of the first protrusion portion, and a

projection extending from a second end of the first protrusion portion. As such, the Nakano patent cannot remedy the deficiencies of the '976 document and Richter. Thus, even if combined, the references do not disclose all the elements of the claimed invention.

Further in regards to claim 13, none of the references disclose or suggest "at least one protrusion on the outer surface of the peripheral wall, said protrusion having a pair of protrusion portions extending in an axial direction of said peripheral wall, said pair being located faced to each other at a distance slightly larger than an axial size of said ring-like portion, ... wherein said pair is located against the first axial end of said ring-like portion and the second axial end of the ring-like portion when said ring-like portion is fitted against said peripheral wall of the rotor yoke" as recited in claim 11. The Office Action cites Nakano as disclosing these elements, however, the Office Action does not specify the elements in the Nakano device that make up such a structure, and it is respectfully queried where the Examiner believes such structure is present in Nakano.

Nakano discloses projecting pieces 8a and 8b formed on the bottom surface of a retaining plate 6 (Abstract). In Nakano, both of the projecting pieces are located on an axial end rather than on the peripheral wall, and a ring-like portion of an inductor forming member of a rotor is not even disclosed. Therefore, Nakano does not disclose or suggest a protrusion having a pair of protrusion portions on the surface of the peripheral wall and extending in an axial direction of the peripheral wall, and the pair of protrusion portions being located faced to each other at a distance slightly larger than an axial size of the ring-like portion. As such, the Nakano patent cannot remedy the deficiencies of the '976 document and Richter. Thus, even if combined, the references do not disclose all the elements of the claimed invention.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the

Appl. No. 09/836,617  
Amdt. Dated November 4, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of August 4, 2003

application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33498.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:   
Ronald M. Kachmarik, Reg. No. 34512

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: November 4, 2003